For the Northern District of California

| 1 | |
|----------|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 6 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 7 | |
| 8 | In re: JDS UNIPHASE CORPORATION No. C-02-1486 CW (EDL) SECURITIES LITIGATION |
| 9 | ORDER VACATING HEARING |
| 10 | This document relates to ALL ACTIONS |
| 11 | |
| 12 | On December 20, 2005, Lead Plaintiff filed a motion for issuance of a letter rogatory to the |
| 13 | Superior Court of the Province of Ontario, Canada to obtain discovery from Thomas Pitre, a former |
| 14 | JDS Uniphase employee who lives there. On January 3, 2006, Defendants JDS Uniphase and Kevin |
| 15 | Kalkhoven filed statements of non-opposition to the issuance of the letter rogatory. The parties, |
| 16 | however, ask the Court to make additional prospective orders regarding the procedure and scope of |
| 17 | the discovery in Canada. Because this matter is appropriate for hearing without oral argument, the |
| 18 19 | January 24, 2006 hearing is vacated. The Court grants Plaintiff's motion. |
| 20 | The Court declines to make any advisory rulings regarding the Canadian discovery. The |
| 21 | parties should, of course, comply with applicable Local Rules. Questions regarding the scope of the |
| 22 | discovery would appear to be more properly addressed to the Canadian court. The Court has no |
| 23 | reason to doubt that the Canadian court will recognize the importance of this deposition and give |
| 24 | each party an appropriate and fair opportunity to participate. |
| 25 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 26 | Dated: January 18, 2006 Elizabeth D. Laporte |
| 27 | United States Magistrate Judge |
| 28 | |